

Appl. No. 10/065, 005  
Amendment dated January 18, 2005  
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated October 18, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to by the Examiner because the acronym "ISDN" needs to be spelled out when it appears for the first time in the claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct for this defect. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

#### Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jirgal (US 6,751,695) in view of Klingman (US 6,219,736). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As amended, claim 1 recites an interface unit for communication between an ISDN-based bus and a processor bus, wherein data in the ISDN-based bus is transferred in ISDN frames divided into a plurality of slots. The interface unit comprises a data transfer unit and a control unit for controlling the transfer of data between the process or bus and ISDN-based bus, wherein the interface unit is capable of accessing all slots of an ISDN frame.

Jirgal teaches a bus bridge device for enabling a device based on an advanced system bus (ASB) protocol to communicate with a device based on peripheral component interconnect (PCI) protocol. Applicants submit that Jirgal nowhere teaches or suggests an interface unit for communication between an ISDN-based bus and a processor bus, wherein the interface unit is capable of accessing all slots of an ISDN frame.

The Examiner relies on Klingman to suggest that the bus bridge device of Jirgal could be modified to support different protocols such as ISDN and USB. Even if this were true, the combination, as proposed by the Examiner, Jirgal and Klingman would only suggest modifying Jirgal's bus bridge to operate with an ISDN or USB protocol. However, providing an interface

Appl. No. 10/065, 005  
Amendment dated January 18, 2005  
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated October 18, 2004

unit which is capable of accessing all slots of an ISDN frame as recited in claimed 1 is nowhere taught or suggested by Jirgal or Klingman, alone or in combination. At best, the combination of Jirgal and Klingman would only suggest a conventional interface unit which operate with an ISDN or USB protocol. As described in the specification, such conventional interface unit is capable of only accessing some of the slots of an ISDN frame. See, for example, specification, paragraph [0003]. As for newly added claims 9 and 23, they recite an interface and a method of transferring data which is capable of accessing all slots of an ISDN frame. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 9 and 23 are patentable over Jirgal and Klingman, alone or in combination. Since claims 2-8, 10-22 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 or 9, these claims are also patentable. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC § 103 (a).

### Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/065, 005  
Amendment dated January 18, 2005  
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated October 18, 2004

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned attorney at his number set out below.

Date: January 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter Chin  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,842

Horizon IP Pte Ltd  
166 Kallang Way,  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Singapore 349249  
Tel.: (65) 9836 9908  
Fax: (65) 6746 8263